

great friendship and the time we have been here together. He is the senior Senator on his side of the aisle, and I am now the senior Senator on this side of the aisle. I will forever be his junior in terms of not only age but service and the admiration I have for him.

I knew Senator BYRD would be interested in the way Lily described this Capitol, its history, and its importance to this country. It is a beautiful article, I think, and I am doubly proud of her and extremely pleased that he would take the time and do us both the honor of putting that article in the RECORD.

I invite my friends and colleagues to read that article. Lily had a different life than most of my other five children. She literally grew up here from the time she was a very small baby, and came to the Senate quite often and sat on my shoulder when we were in conference meetings.

Senator BYRD has always been very gracious about coming to her birthday parties which we held here during the 8 years I was the whip on this side of the aisle. All of our family has such a great admiration for the Senator and for his great history.

I think many people do not realize that he is not only the most senior Senator, but he is the only Senator who went through both the university level and law school level while serving in the Congress. He has a prodigious memory. I think of times when, for instance, we were at the U.S.-British Parliamentary Conference when I encouraged the Senator to tell us some of his memories of serving in the Capitol when we were with our fellow legislators from the Parliament of Britain. We have great memories of that.

I also have a memory of the time when we were in West Virginia when one member of the Parliament made the mistake of saying that Americans didn't know much about the history of our mother country and those who have served Britain and their monarchy. Senator BYRD proceeded to tell us in detail about every single person who ever served in that position, including the husbands and wives of the monarchs of Britain.

I have so many great memories of service with Senator BYRD. I have already ordered a copy of the transcript and the tape of this presentation to send to Lily. I can think of no nicer birthday present to me than that the Senator from West Virginia would honor my daughter and the article she has written about the place we both love, the Capitol of the United States.

I thank the Senator very much for his courtesy.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator will yield briefly—and I am not going to keep my friend from Texas waiting. He has been standing and waiting to be recognized.

It was a pleasure, may I say to my friend, to call to the attention of Senators this beautiful article written by Senator STEVENS' daughter Lily. She is a really precocious child. I have watched her from almost day one. I admire her. She is a well-bred woman. She is the flower of womanhood. She is seeking always to enlarge her mind and doing a great job of it.

I am pleased the Senator feels that he rejoices that her article has been mentioned by me. I want to assure him that he is entitled to every plaudit I can bring to bear on this subject. I hope he conveys my love and my admiration to his daughter Lily.

And may I say to the Senator, "Thou art my guide, philosopher, and friend," as the Pope once said. I mean every word of that. I treasure our friendship. I say to Senator STEVENS, and may his beautiful daughter continue to do her work and complete her studies and go on to higher things. She is a fine model, and many of us can learn from her efforts to improve herself. I will certainly do that myself. I thank the Senator. I thank him very much.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senator twice honors me. I do thank the Senator very much. Those of us who have had the privilege of serving here more than a short time develop relationships that I think the rest of the body and perhaps the country don't understand. Very clearly my commitment in terms of friendship and devotion to my friend from West Virginia is equal to his for me. I am very pleased and proud to have that relationship with him.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that after I am recognized, Senator COBURN and Senator DEWINE be recognized for up to 30 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Chair.

#### CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I talk about two subjects that are very near and dear to my heart. The first is the matter of child support enforcement. My colleagues might wonder how does that issue arise. The fact is, last night, the House of Representatives passed their version of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005. As each of us knows, the purpose of that Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 is to actually bring down the Federal deficit by finding cuts in the Federal budget, the Federal budget

that currently comprises something in excess of \$2.5 trillion a year.

This is a very important exercise. This represents the first time, I believe, since 1997 when we have seen real and meaningful cuts in Federal spending. The challenge, of course, is that about a third of the money the Congress spends is discretionary spending. Half of that third is defense spending, and the rest of it is homeland security and other discretionary programs. But some of that you can tell by the mere description is hardly discretionary because it is important to our national security.

My point is that two-thirds of the Federal budget is not, even under any conception or definition, discretionary spending. It is Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security, and we simply have to come to grips with that so-called entitlement or nondiscretionary spending in order to draw the reins in on a Federal Government that continues to grow day by day in its scope and size and expense.

I am here to say I think there are some cuts that make more sense than others and some cuts make no sense whatsoever. I consider child support money that goes to assist the States in collecting child support to fall into that last category—cuts that make no sense whatsoever. Let me explain.

The House bill will cut \$5 billion in Federal funds from the child support program over 5 years—\$5 billion over 5 years. It will cut \$15.8 billion, almost \$16 billion, over 10 years. This translates into a 40-percent reduction in Federal spending for the child support program. My State of Texas would lose \$258 million over 5 years and \$824 million over 10 years.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart prepared by the Center for Law and Social Policy which lays out the proposed cut to Federal child support funding State by State be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—PROPOSED CUTS TO FEDERAL CHILD SUPPORT FUNDING  
(\$ millions)

State	5-year Cut 2006–2010	10-Year Cut, 2006– 2015
Alabama	–187	–59
Arizona	–188	–59
California	–1,006	–3,211
Connecticut	–71	–228
Dist. Columbia	–15	–49
Georgia	–105	–334
Idaho	–19	–61
Illinois	–161	–514
Indiana	–61	–194
Iowa	–49	–157
Kansas	–47	–151
Louisiana	–55	–176

TABLE 2.—PROPOSED CUTS TO FEDERAL CHILD SUPPORT FUNDING—Continued  
[\$ millions]

State	5-year Cut 2006–2010	10-Year Cut, 2006– 2015
Maine	–22	–72
Maryland	–94	–299
Massachusetts	–88	–282
Michigan	–249	–795
Minnesota	–133	–425
Mississippi	–23	–72
Missouri	–82	–261
Montana	–12	–40
Nebraska	–42	–134
Nevada	–38	–121
N. Hampshire	–15	–48
New Jersey	–173	–554
New Mexico	–37	–119
New York	–303	–967
North Carolina	–106	–339
North Dakota	–11	–35
Ohio	–288	–918
Oklahoma	–44	–139
Oregon	–49	–156
Pennsylvania	–188	–602
Rhode Island	–11	–35
South Carolina	–33	–105
South Dakota	–8	–25
Tennessee	–75	–238
Texas	–258	–824
Utah	–34	–110
Vermont	–11	–36
Virginia	–80	–256
Washington	–130	–415
West Virginia	–36	–114
Wisconsin	–96	–308
Wyoming	–10	–31
Nationwide	–\$4,962	–\$15,846

CLASP calculations based on preliminary estimates by the Congressional Budget Office of the total cut in federal child support funding under the House Ways and Means Committee budget reconciliation chairman's "mark." The total cut was distributed by state based on each state's share of total child support administrative expenditures in 2004, as reported by the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement Preliminary Report FY 2004, table 7.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, those are the cuts, \$5 billion over 5 years, \$16 billion roughly over 10 years.

What is the impact of these cuts on child support collected? This will reduce child support collections by \$7.9 billion over 5 years and \$24.1 billion over 10 years.

That is right, for a \$5 billion cut, it eliminates \$7.9 billion in child support collections. For a \$16 billion cut, it eliminates \$24.1 billion in collections over 10 years. In my State of Texas these cuts will reduce child support collections by \$411 million over 5 years and \$1.25 billion over 10 years.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that a chart also prepared by the Center for Law and Social Policy, which states the projected impact on child support collections State by State, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—PROJECTED IMPACT ON CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS  
[\$ millions]

State	5-year Cut 2006–2010	10-Year Cut, 2006–2015
Alabama	–93	–285
Alaska	–31	–95
Arizona	–94	–286
Arkansas	–61	–185
California	–1,601	–4,884
Colorado	–104	–316
Connecticut	–113	–346
Delaware	–35	–108
Dist. Columbia	–24	–74
Florida	–366	–1,115
Georgia	–166	–508
Hawaii	–15	–45
Idaho	–30	–92

TABLE 3.—PROJECTED IMPACT ON CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS—Continued  
[\$ millions]

State	5-year Cut 2006–2010	10-Year Cut, 2006–2015
Illinois	–256	–782
Indiana	–97	–295
Iowa	–78	–239
Kansas	–75	–230
Kentucky	–85	–258
Louisiana	–88	–268
Maine	–36	–109
Maryland	–149	–454
Massachusetts	–140	–428
Michigan	–397	–1,210
Minnesota	–212	–647
Mississippi	–36	–110
Missouri	–130	–397
Montana	–20	–61
Nebraska	–67	–204
Nevada	–60	–183
N. Hampshire	–24	–74
New Jersey	–276	–842
New Mexico	–59	–181
New York	–482	–1,470
North Carolina	–169	–516
North Dakota	–18	–54
Ohio	–458	–1,396
Oklahoma	–69	–211
Oregon	–78	–237
Pennsylvania	–300	–915
Rhode Island	–18	–54
South Carolina	–53	–160
South Dakota	–12	–37
Tennessee	–119	–363
Texas	–411	–1,253
Utah	–55	–167
Vermont	–18	–55
Virginia	–128	–390
Washington	–207	–631
West Virginia	–57	–173
Wisconsin	–153	–468
Wyoming	–15	–47
Nationwide	–\$7,900	–\$24,100

CLASP calculations based on preliminary estimates by the Congressional Budget Office of the projected effect of funding cuts on collections under the House Ways and Means Committee budget reconciliation chairman's "mark." The total cut was distributed by state based on each state's share of total child support distributed collections in 2004, as reported by the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement Preliminary Report FY 2004, table 7.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, in the year 2004, the child support program collected \$ 21.9 billion, while the program costs were \$5.3 billion. Let me make this clear for my colleagues. In other words, for every \$1 spent by the Federal taxpayer \$4.38 in child support was collected for the children who need it. This is not the typical Federal program. This is not money that once spent we see no real benefit from. Rather, this is one that for every dollar that is invested \$4.38 in child support is collected for the children who need it and who are legally entitled to it.

The President's 2006 budget cites the child support program as "one of the highest rated block formula grants of all reviewed programs Government-wide." This high rating is due to its strong mission, effective management, and demonstration of measurable progress toward meeting annual and long-term performance measures.

Even there, the numbers and these sort of accolades about this program do not tell the whole story. The story is completed by the fact that many children who receive child support are thereby prevented from drawing down other Government programs. For example, child support enforcement reduces reliance on Medicaid, temporary assistance to needy families, and other social service programs. It is estimated that more than 1 million Americans were lifted out of poverty through child support programs in the year 2002 alone.

So in addition to money that is a good return on investment, \$4.38 for every dollar, this money actually avoids additional expenditures of tax dollars by creating individuals who are qualified for other Government programs at a lot more expense to the Federal taxpayer.

The problem with these cuts is that they are likely to reverse dramatic improvements in the child support program's performance over the past decade, and they may well force many families back on the welfare caseload. This means former welfare families and working families of modest income will lose an important source of income that now enables them to maintain financial self-sufficiency and thereby having to draw on Government resources through public assistance programs.

The reason I feel so passionately about these particular cuts and the effectiveness of the child support enforcement program is that for 4 years before I came to the Senate I served as attorney general of Texas. It was my job, on behalf of approximately 1.2 million children, to see that they got the child support that they deserved, that they needed, and that they were legally entitled to.

I am proud to say that my State ranks second in the Nation in terms of total collections, collections of about \$1.8 billion in fiscal year 2005, and an increase of 83 percent of collections since fiscal year 2000.

Now, that did not happen by accident. The reason it did happen is because of the great work being done by the men and women in the child support enforcement division of the State of Texas. It also happened because of the money that is provided by the Federal Government to help fund this necessary function. Due to the good work of these hard working men and women in the child support division, obligations, that is court orders, establishing support have risen from 55 to 82 percent of the qualifying population, and the cost-effectiveness in Texas has gone from \$4.96 to \$6.81.

I mentioned the national average of \$4.38 for every dollar spent. In Texas, we now collect \$6.81 for every dollar spent.

If the financial benefits, if the cost-effectiveness of this program, and if the avoidance of other costs to the Federal taxpayer were not enough, there are other intangible benefits to a strong and effective child support enforcement program. I have seen with my own eyes that too many families, when they divorce, reach a tacit agreement with regard to their children. Moms who frequently are the ones who have custody of the children sometimes

reach a tacit agreement with their ex-spouse, typically the father, that if they do not exercise their visitation rights that the mother will not press the father for the financial support to which their children are legally entitled.

What happens is that these children become two-time losers. Not only are they denied the financial benefits that the law says they are entitled to, they are denied contact with both parents that every child needs in order to have the best chance of success.

Indeed, one of the intangible benefits of an effective child support program is not just the money collected, it is not just lifting children who would otherwise be in poverty out of poverty, it is not just avoiding the additional expenses of Government programs that would otherwise be invoked if that support was not there, it is literally the benefit of having a mother and a father both engaged, involved, and committed to the welfare of their children.

I can think of no more important purpose that our efforts could serve than to reunite mothers, fathers, and children in a collective effort to improve the status of our children and their prospects for a bright future.

So I hope in the conference on the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 our colleagues in the House will reconsider, and I hope our colleagues in the Senate will persuade them that of all the cuts they might have chosen these were the least deserving and that the money should be reinstated. I am confident throughout the \$2.5 trillion Federal budget that there are other programs, other waste, other fat, other ineffective programs that could be more effectively cut and with far less damage to the most vulnerable among us.

#### PATRIOT ACT

Finally, just for a couple of minutes, maybe 5, I want to speak about another subject, and that is the USA PATRIOT Act. It has been more than 4 years since our country was hit on September 11 by terrorists who care nothing for our way of life and nothing for the laws of war. They have attacked, because they could, innocent civilians in their jihad against those who have different ways of life and different views.

We know the PATRIOT Act has been largely responsible for making America safer by bringing down the wall that prevented the sharing of information between law enforcement and intelligence agencies, by making available to our FBI and other intelligence-gathering bodies the same sort of techniques that are currently used against organized crime members and other criminals. Simply, what this body did in the PATRIOT Act was make sure that we used every legal and reasonable means to root out terrorism, to investigate it, and to stop it before it killed other innocent Americans.

The PATRIOT Act was passed shortly after September 11 by a strong bipartisan vote of 98 to 1 in the Senate and

357 to 66 in the House. As I said, the PATRIOT Act enhanced law enforcement and intelligence agencies' ability to gather and analyze intelligence information and to use the most modern communications technologies, such as e-mail, cellular telephones, and the Internet, and it strengthened criminal laws and penalties against terrorists.

As always, we must be concerned with the right balance between the need to protect innocent American lives and the need to preserve our civil liberties. Despite the dire predictions of some groups, the PATRIOT Act has not eroded any of our rights that we hold near and dear as Americans. To the contrary, the PATRIOT Act has enabled the Justice Department, the FBI, and the CIA and other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to cooperate and to share information and thereby save American lives and protect what is perhaps the most important civil liberty of all, and that is freedom from future terrorist attacks.

I serve on the Judiciary Committee, and we have held 25 oversight hearings to date within the Judiciary Committee to ensure that we have both the tools we need and that we struck the right balance between civil liberties and our need to be secure. As all of our colleagues know, several sections of the PATRIOT Act are set to expire, sections 203 and 218, on December 31, 2005. These are the very provisions that have been instrumental in bringing down this wall that has previously separated different agencies of the Federal Government in getting information that is needed in order to save American lives and to stop terrorist attacks.

I would just read briefly from recent testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee by Peter Fitzgerald, the U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, who has recently been in the news. He has recounted from personal experience how this wall between law enforcement and intelligence personnel have operated in practice. He said:

I was on a prosecution team in New York that began a criminal investigation of Osama Bin Laden in early 1996. The team—prosecutors and FBI agents assigned to the criminal case—had access to a number of sources. We could talk to citizens. We could talk to local police officers. We could talk to other U.S. Government agencies. We could talk to foreign police officers. Even foreign intelligence personnel. And foreign citizens. And we did all those things as often as we could. We could even talk to al Qaeda members—and we did. We actually called several members and associates of al Qaeda to testify before a grand jury in New York. And we even debriefed al Qaeda members overseas who agreed to become cooperating witnesses. But there was one group of people we were not permitted to talk to. Who? The FBI agents across the street from us in lower Manhattan assigned to a parallel intelligence investigation of Osama Bin Laden and al Qaeda. We could not learn what information they had gathered. That was “the wall.”

Well, people who remember the hearings before the 9/11 Commission will remember that there were a number of

high-profile witnesses from Janet Reno, the former Attorney General of the United States, to former Attorney General John Ashcroft, who served during the first term of the Bush administration, and FBI Director Mueller. Witness after witness testified that that wall between criminal investigators and our intelligence-gathering communication prevented the sharing of information that has been absolutely critical in protecting innocent American lives and preventing future terrorist attacks.

It is that same wall that will be resurrected on December 31, 2005, unless the U.S. Congress acts. It is absolutely critical that we look at this with cold-eyed clarity and not be swayed by scare tactics or emotional appeals.

I am astonished, when I look at the reality of how the PATRIOT Act has made our Nation safer, that there are those who would use scare tactics to try to convince them that America's civil liberties are somehow imperiled. In fact, the American Civil Liberties Union, time and time again, through fundraising appeals and elsewhere, has misrepresented the PATRIOT Act in a way that I believe has frightened the American people. They happen to use it to raise money in their direct mail campaign, but it has had the disservice of breaking American resolve and confusing the American people about exactly what is at stake and what the benefits of the PATRIOT Act are.

Perhaps the most telling manifestation of the effectiveness of their scare tactics and their misinformation campaign is that approximately 300 different municipalities across America have passed resolutions calling for the repeal of the PATRIOT Act. I think we have to mark that off to a lack of good information, or perhaps the gullibility on the part of some of these city councils and others. Because, as the Senate Judiciary Committee has found out, when you ask the American Civil Liberties Union to detail a single violation of American civil liberties as a result of the passage and implementation of the PATRIOT Act, they have been able to come up with none, zero, zilch, nada.

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, with whom I am honored to serve on the Senate Judiciary Committee, who always does a very diligent job on behalf of her constituents and on behalf of the Senate, asked the ACLU to search the records and come up with a single instance that they believe demonstrated or proved that the PATRIOT Act imperiled the civil liberties of the American people, and they did not come up with a single example.

I hope, as we continue to work on a conference report to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act, that the Members of the Senate will do our jobs with a clarity of mind based upon evidence and not yield to the scare tactics by those who want to create a disinformation campaign and perhaps confuse the American people about the importance of the PATRIOT Act. It is absolutely critical that we reauthorize this act, that

we not allow that wall to be resurrected because the truth is, we owe it to the American people and we owe it to those whose lives will literally be lost unless we do our job and reauthorize the PATRIOT Act before provisions of that act expire on December 31, 2005.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEMINT). Under the previous order, the Senate having received a conference report on H.R. 2528, that report is considered agreed to and the motion to reconsider that act is laid on the table.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, at this time, under the regular order and a unanimous consent request, the distinguished Senator from Ohio was to be recognized. He has acquiesced in my behalf that I may be recognized for 15 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business for 15 minutes, to be followed by the Senator from Ohio, and that the Senator from Colorado will be recognized after the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the introduction of S. Res. 329 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DEWINE pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 321 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

#### HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

ARMY PRIVATE FIRST CLASS HARRISON J. MEYER

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise this evening on the floor of the U.S. Senate to pay tribute to a brave, young Ohioan, who lost his life while serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Army Private First Class Harrison J. Meyer, a combat medic from Worthington, OH, was killed on November 26, 2004, while attempting to rescue a wounded comrade during a firefight. Born on Veterans Day—November 11, 1984—he was barely 20 years old at the time of his death.

When I think about the sacrifices of our men and women in uniform, I am reminded of something President Ronald Reagan said about the strength of the American people. He said this:

Putting people first has always been America's secret weapon. It's the way we've kept the spirit of our revolutions alive—a spirit that drives us to dream and dare, and take risks for the greater good.

Harrison Meyer was always taking risks for the greater good—always put-

ting others first and selflessly giving of himself for his fellow man. According to Medical Platoon Sergeant Randolph L. Nutt:

[Private First Class Meyer] fully knew what the dangers were and willingly accepted them as a risk to save others' lives. He made the ultimate sacrifice so that others may live. Six other soldiers are still alive directly due to his actions.

Indeed, Mr. President, Harrison Meyer—Harry to his friends and family—embodied the true American spirit that President Reagan described.

Harry grew up in Worthington and attended Thomas Worthington High School. He graduated in 2003. While in high school, Harry belonged to the track team for 3 years. He competed as a pole-vaulter. Andy Cox, a U.S. history teacher and track coach at Thomas Worthington, remembers Harry as a "teddy bear who made everybody laugh. He was a real team player—always wanting to help people." Coach Cox went on to say that "Harry was the kid who was trying to make all the other kids relax, feel good about competing."

Harry often brought homemade treats to the track meets for the entire team. Coach Cox emphasized the popularity of his cheesecake. As he affectionately recalls, "[Harry] was a great cook!"

Harry did not join the track team during his senior year because he wanted to focus his attention on his upcoming military career. Still, however, he attended all of the school's track meets, and, according to Coach Cox "he'd always bring something homemade for the team."

Harry was also a member of the school's choir, and for four summers, Harry worked at the Worthington municipal pool doing various jobs, including serving as a lifeguard.

According to his mother, Harry was deeply affected by the September 11th terrorist attacks. He enlisted in the Army's pre-graduation program, and shortly after his high school graduation, he was inducted. He was stationed in Korea and assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 503rd Infantry Regiment, 2nd Infantry Division, Camp Howze, before leaving in August 2004, for Iraq. His mom said that Harry's selflessness was one of the reasons he decided to become a medic after joining the Army.

In fact, according to Chris Begin, a good friend of Harry's, Harry wanted to go on to medical school after returning from Iraq.

While in Iraq, Harry and his comrades faced danger daily. Harry's mom recalls that before he was killed, Harry had treated a dozen seriously wounded soldiers. She said that "he knew (insurgents) were targeting medics. He indicated it was a very dangerous place. 'But, he always told me—'Don't worry, Mom.'"

The dangers became too grave on November 26, 2004 near Ar Ramadi. Harry was killed the day after Thanksgiving, while trying to pull a wounded comrade to safety during an insurgent attack on his unit.

At the services held in Harry's honor after his death, friends and family recalled Harry's heroism and generosity, saying that the cause of his death reflected how he had lived. According to his mom, "Harry had always wanted to help people. He didn't think about his own welfare. He'd give you anything he had."

I recently came across a touching reminder of Harry's lasting impact on others. It is a posting on an Internet tribute for service members who have been killed in either Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. A friend of Harry's—Pamela Moorehead from Worthington—posted the following email message:

Harry, I was thinking about you today. I'm not sure what made me think of you. I think I was just reminded by something someone said. It's September 26, 2005, so in one month you will have been gone for a year. Everyone still misses you. The memories from pole vaulting with you and hanging out with you and Brandon make me both happy and sad. To your family—Harry is one of my heroes, and we all still think about him. We miss him and continue to keep him and all of you in our thoughts and prayers.

Harrison Meyer was a kind soul, with a warmth that touched many people. My wife Fran and I keep Harry's family—his parents Deborah and William; and his three sisters—Lynn, Bronwyn, and Kelley, in our prayers.

I would like to conclude my remarks with an excerpt from a poem titled "American Hero, written by Harry's cousin Jordan Michael Meyer. The poem is in remembrance of Harry:

He is out there on the front lines.  
He knows the risk.  
He knows the sacrifice.  
He is going to put it all on the line and role the dice.  
The man is fighting for a better life.  
The American soldier found his home after this brutal fight.  
Now looking down upon us he sets flight.  
Always keeping us in sight.  
He won't stop protecting us, day and night.  
He is an American soldier, brought up on love, alone, feeling so far from home.  
He hides his fear, doing anything to protect those who are dear, knowing death is near.  
He is a young man taking upon the sacrifice of a nation he holds dear.

Harrison Meyer held his Nation dear, and we hold dear his memory. We will never forget him.

MARINE CORPORAL NATHAN R. ANDERSON

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, while deployed in Iraq, Marine Corporal Nathan "Nate" Anderson made sure to write his family back home in Howard, OH, as often as he could. After witnessing the death of a good friend, Nate wrote that "the service of freedom demands sacrifice." He tried to calm his family's fears as he continued, "No worries. I will be fine wherever I end up. I have the Lord on my side and guardian angels on both shoulders. I am good to go."

I rise today on the floor of the United States Senate to pay tribute to this brave Marine. With the Lord on his side, Nate left this Earth on November